

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-20 remain for examination.

Drawing Change:

Applicant is submitting herewith a replacement sheet for Fig. 20 in order to correct a minor error noted therein. In particular, in the line connecting device 1003 to the device 1004 the label for the arrow should indicate "A3" rather than A4 as in the original drawing. Fig. 20 has been corrected accordingly. Support for the change is seen from the specification on page 6, lines 3-4. No new matter has been added.

Prior Art Rejections:

Claims 1-4, 7-9 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Limieux. Further, claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Limieux in view of Matsuzawa.

The Examiners rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has apparently equated applicant's first terminal to reference sign 226A and a second terminal to reference sign 226B. The Examiner states that these terminals are connected through a packet transfer device identified as reference signs 218A and 218B provided between the terminals. However, reference sign 226A is a network termination node or module and likewise 226B is a network termination module. Both of these modules are connected to the WL-DSLAM (wireless digital subscriber line access multiplexer) 222. It is not seen how the DSLAM 218A and 218B are connected between the first terminal identified as reference sign 226A and the second terminal identified as reference terminal 226B. Moreover, the Examiner has based the rejection on a belief that Limieux teaches a label request packet transmission method for transmitting an original label request packet. The Examiner specifically points to column 5, lines 45-62. However, it is pointed out that Limieux does not discuss label request packets at all. The discussion in the portion

referenced by the Examiner is a general discussion of the LDP procedures and messages. For example, it is stated as follows:

An essential element of the LDP procedures is by assigning a label to information packets, a transmitting device is rendered capable of forwarding all packets with the same label in the same way. If the packet is to be forwarded solely by looking at the label, then at a minimum, all packets with the same incoming label must be forwarded to the same port or ports with the same encapsulations, and with the same next hop label, if necessary.

There is no mention whatsoever of a label request packet.

Moreover, applicant has amended claim 1 in order to clarify certain recitations thereof. A minor stylistic change has been made to replace the term “terminals” with the term “first terminal and second terminal” which were previously recited. Further, applicant has made it clear that the transmitting step is for transmitting the plurality of divisional label request packets in parallel to each section. This aspect of applicant’s invention is described, for example, in applicant’s invention as originally filed on page 63 beginning at line 17 and continuing through page 66, line 15. Particular attention is directed to the discussion on page 65, line 26 to page 66, line 15. In this section, applicant teaches that the request packets are transmitted in parallel to each of the sections or “partial networks (groups)”. As such, applicant has amended independent claim 1 to specifically recite the parallel transmission and a similar change has been made to all of applicant’s independent claims.

Not only does Limieux, not teach label request packets, he does not teach the parallel transmission of the label requests packets to groups or sections within the network. The fact that Limieux utilizes a plurality of ATM-add/drop multiplexers 206A-206D is simply not a teaching that the network is divided into a plurality of subsections or partial networks and that applicant specifically recited label request packet is transmitted in parallel to each of the

sections. Quite simply, the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Inasmuch as applicant has amended all of the independent claims to recite the parallel limitation therein, it is submitted that all of applicant's claims readily distinguish over the Limieux teaching for the reasons indicated above. Further, with regard to claim 18, the teachings of Matsuzawa do not cure the basic deficiencies of Limieux and, thus, the rejection of claim 18 is deemed to be overcome since the Patent and Trademark Office has not made out a *prima facie* case of obviousness under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Allowable Claims:

The Examiner has indicated that claims 5-17 are allowed. Further, the Examiner has indicated that claims 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 14, 19 and 20 contain allowable subject matter.

However, in view of the amendments made hereto and the argument set forth above, it is submitted that all of applicant's claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusions:

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date December 2, 2004

By David A. Blumenthal

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

David A. Blumenthal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 26,257